REFERENCE COPY

COMMANDERS DIGEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE • WASHINGTON, D.C.

Vol. 8, No. 12 June 20, 1970

DEPUTY ASSISTANT FOR CIVIL RIGHTS—Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, right, and Roger T. Kelley, left, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, confer with Mr. Frank Render II who has been appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights succeeding Mr. L. Howard Bennett. Mr. Render will be responsible for equality of opportunity in the Armed Forces, both military and civilian personnel. (DOD Photo)

Visits U.S. Troops

Secretary Laird Discusses NATO, SALT While On European Tour

Following meetings with the NATO Nuclear Planning Group in Venice, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird said, "This is the time when it is to the advantage of the Soviet Union, as well as to the advantage of the United States, to enter into a meaningful strategic arms limitation agreement" (at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks).

The Secretary attended the Planning Group meeting June 8-9. On June 10 he met with military officials at Stuttgart, Federal Republic of Germany. On June 11 he attended the NATO Defense Planning Committee meeting in Brussels.

Before his scheduled return to the U.S. June 26, Secretary Laird is expected to visit U.S. military units and servicemen and their families in Spain, United Kingdom, and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean.

Secretary Laird also had a meeting with Ambassador Philip Habib, Chief U.S. Negotiator at the Paris Peace Talks.

(Continued On Page Three)

Decrease Projected In Draft Call For 1970, Defense Requests 15,000 Men In July

The Department of Defense has projected a decrease in the annual draft call for calendar year 1970 ranging from 150,000-180,000 compared to the original program calling for 250,000 inductees.

DOD officials attributed the lower number "to the redeployments being made as a result of progress in the Vietnamization program and subsequent reductions in military strength."

DOD has requested the Selective Service System to provide Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Stations with 15,000 inductees in July for assignment to the Army.

Officials said, "This request supports currently approved strength levels and will assure a timely flow of replacements completing their terms of service."

Monthly draft calls for the first six months of 1970 were: January—12,500; February—19,000; March—19,000; April—19,000; May—15,000; June—15,000.

Coast Guard Mission, Status Topic Of DOT Secretary Volpe

The Department of Transportation is a many-faceted Cabinet level operation, headed by Secretary John Volpe, three times governor of Massachusetts. In an interview, Secretary Volpe described his present post as "challenging, forceful, demanding and sometimes frustrating, but a job I am enjoying very, very much."

Here are excerpts from the interview:

Q—Mr. Secretary, in 1967 the Coast Guard was transferred to the Department of Transportation from the Treasury Department. Why was this action taken?

A—This action was taken primarily because of about 90 to 85 per cent of the mission of the U. S. Coast Guard is involved in transportation. Last year the Coast Guard performed about 50,000 search and rescue missions at sea or inland waterways, rescuing people who had—whose boats had overturned or become stranded.

They take care of all the port work, security of the ports,

(Continued On Page Seven)

New Banking Concept Okayed For Military Stationed Overseas

Commences July 1 At Pacific Bases

The Department of Defense and Treasury Department will inaugurate a new concept in banking services for military personnel and their dependents in all Pacific commands July 1. The new program begins worldwide Oct. 1.

DOD banking officials call the concept a "giant step" toward meeting the need for better banking services for personnel in overseas areas.

Hundreds of people in DOD, the Treasury Department, Pacific commands and large commercial banking institutions of America were involved in formulating the new program.

Effective in Pacific commands July 1, all savings accounts with military banking facilities will be eliminated and a new checking account procedure will be established which will draw interest at the rate of five per cent per annum on an account balance of $100 or more during any one month.

This program will allow the first two checks to be drawn on an account during a month without cost to the account holder. If more than two checks are written during the month there will be a 10-cent charge for each additional check with a maximum charge on the account limited to $3 in any one month. Also, there will be a maintenance charge of 40 cents when an individual has used his account in excess of two free checks.

Generally, the new special banking arrangement is seen as a vehicle for promoting and encouraging Defense Department personnel to use the military banking facilities by making it easy and advantageous for them to establish automatic payroll deposits with their local military banking facility.

A DOD spokesman said, "If the account holder does not choose to use the arrangement as a checking account, he may use the account for savings purposes and enjoy five per cent interest on balances over $100."

DOD banking officials are convinced the facilities will be of immeasurable benefit, not only from the standpoint of assisting individuals to gain better management of their personal funds, but also in providing a means for getting maximum funds returned to the United States which would otherwise be spent in foreign markets.

The enormity of the undertaking can best be visualized from statistics gathered by the Pacific Command. For example, on April 1, 1970, there were 112 banking offices, suboffices, mobile units and conversion points in the Pacific commands providing banking services for Defense personnel and official and quasi-official activities.

Defense officials report more than 240,000 individual bank accounts in the Pacific Command with the amount on deposit in excess of $107 million.

They point out that during 1969 the number of individual checking accounts in the Pacific Command increased by 43 per cent and the amounts on deposit increased by about 50 per cent.

The Defense Department defines a Military Banking Facility (MBF) as "a banking office located on a military installation which has been specifically authorized by the Treasury Department to provide banking services for that installation." Thus, an MBF is unique in that it is a financial agent of the U.S. Treasury, performing a service for the military forces.

Basically, the new banking arrangement represents a step toward uniformity of banking services and fees charged for such services by the MBFs in all overseas areas. DOD believes, that in many respects, this arrangement offers additional benefits for the serviceman that were not available heretofore.

It took years to work out the arrangement. For example, the special checking account arrangement was introduced in the Republic of Vietnam and Thailand in 1966 and in Taiwan under similar conditions during 1968 on a test basis. Since that time, Defense officials say, the number of individual accounts in Taiwan has more than doubled. At some Taiwan bases there was an 80 per cent participation in the program.

As reported at the Military Banking Facility Conference in Hawaii during April, 1970, "our experience in Vietnam indicates that the five per cent checking account provides an attractive and flexible banking service supplementing other banking programs available to the serv-

(Continued On Page Eight)

MILITARY BANKING FACILITY BANKING ARRANGEMENTS

CHECKING & SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

(Non-Combat Areas Overseas)

CURRENT SYSTEM	PROPOSED SYSTEM
SAVINGS ACCOUNTS	
• INTEREST @ 4 ½% PER ANNUM ON CURRENT BALANCES NOT BELOW $50 DURING MONTH	• INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTS DISCONTINUED
CHECKING ACCOUNTS	
BALANCES BELOW $300 • FIRST 2 CHECKS FREE • 15¢ PER CHECK IN EXCESS OF 2 CHECKS	**BALANCE IN ACCOUNT NOT RELATED TO CHARGES** • INTEREST PAID ON ACCOUNT BALANCES AT 5% PER ANNUM ON MINIMUM BALANCES IN EACH ACCOUNT THAT DID NOT FALL BELOW $100 DURING THE MONTH • FIRST 2 CHECKS ARE FREE • 10¢ PER CHECK IN EXCESS OF 2 CHECKS (Max. charge per month - $3.00) • MINIMUM CHARGE WHEN MORE THAN 2 CHECKS ARE PAID IN ONE MONTH IS 40¢
BALANCES OVER $300 • NO CHARGE IRRESPECTIVE OF NUMBER OF CHECKS PAID	
SPECIAL CHECKING ACCOUNTS FOR COMBAT AREAS (Vietnam, Thailand & (Taiwan))	
• NO SERVICE CHARGES ON INDIVIDUALS ACCOUNTS BASED ON ACTIVITY OF ACCOUNTS AND BALANCES MAINTAINED	• NO CHANGES IN CURRENT SYSTEM. TAIWAN-NOT A COMBAT AREA WILL REVERT TO NON-COMBAT STATUS 1 OCTOBER 1970.

Secretary Laird Discusses NATO, SALT While On European Tour

(Continued From Page One)

Particular emphasis was placed on prisoner of war matters.

The Secretary held two news conferences June 10—at Stuttgart and Brussels, respectively. Excerpts from the conferences follow:

Question: The West German government is in the process of negotiating non-aggression pacts with the Soviet Union. Could you tell us what possible significance this can have to the military situation in Europe and particularly Big Four response to . . . under Potsdam and other post-war agreements?

Answer: The Federal Republic of Germany has kept the United States Government fully advised in regard to these developments and the meetings which they have had with the East. We have been well informed on these contacts and certainly our government has not intervened at any time with an objection. It might be well to point out here, that we also are engaged in some discussions with the Soviet Union in Vienna where the SALT talks are taking place. We are hopeful for success in those discussions. We are also engaged in bilateral, as well as four-power discussions, and have been over the last few months, with the Soviet Union as far as the Middle East is concerned. President Nixon has made it very clear that in the decade of the 1970s he hopes we can go from a period of confrontation to an era of negotiation and we are hopeful that the negotiations which we are presently involved in with the Soviet Union that there will be success.

I'd just like to point out one additional point and that is that we have kept our allies—the allies in NATO—very well informed in the degree of consultation that the United States is carried forward as far as the SALT talks and other discussions which we have had with the Soviet Union . . .

Question: You were quoted in Venice as telling the Nuclear Planning Group that the time is now particularly favorable for success at the SALT talks, the implication being that it might be less favorable later. Could you give us some of your thinking on this, a little of the background?

Answer: As I pointed out in my report to the Congress this year, the Soviet Union has since 1965 acquired a momentum in the field of strategic nuclear weapons, both offensive and defensive, which is of concern to the United States and to our allies. This momentum if continued would place the Soviet Union in a superior position by the year 1974-75, by the middle time frame as we go into this decade of the 1970s. It could have the effect of making the United States a second-rate military power. We have sufficient deterrents, sufficient retaliatory power today to, I believe, prevent any kind of nuclear exchange in the world. Because of the kind of deterrent force that is being maintained it would be folly for any nation to go forward and use nuclear weapons in a so-called first strike or surprise attack.

But because of the momentum that has been acquired by the Soviet Union since 1965, the United States is in a position of transition. It will have to make some very difficult, tough decisions within the next 12-18 months if it is to maintain its retaliatory capability and the deterrent force that is necessary to maintain peace through the decade of the 1970s and beyond. We can postpone those decisions for 12 to 18 months perhaps, but then if there is not any kind of agreement reached in that frame of time we will have to move forward. So I believe that this is the time for these decisions to go forward and I believe that this is the time when it is to the advantage of the Soviet Union, as well as to the advantage of the United States, to enter into a meaningful strategic arms limitation agreement, and this was the thrust of the statement which I made before some of the press and some of my colleagues at the Nuclear Planning Group.

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING—Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, left, is greeted at Stuttgart, Federal Republic of Germany, by Air Force General David A. Burchinal, Deputy Commander in Chief of the U.S. European Command. At General Burchinal's right is Army General Andrew J. Goodpaster, Supreme Allied Commander Europe and Commander in Chief of the U.S. European Command. Secretary Laird arrived at Stuttgart from Venice where he attended NATO's Nuclear Planning Group meeting. (USEUCOM Photo)

Some of those tough decisions that I referred to have to do with weapons systems, whether to go into production on systems such as the ULMS (Undersea Long Range Missile System) or production decisions on an advanced manned strategic bomber. Because of the lead time involved, there is this time limit that is required to be considered as we look to the balance of forces and the question of strategic sufficiency in the latter part of the decade of the 1970s.

Question: Mr. Laird, you are coming back from Venice. There it was told, in the papers at least, that NATO feels much weaker in the conventional way in Europe so that they would consider using tactical nuclear weapons to stop an eventual Soviet thrust into Central Europe. What's your idea about that?

Answer: I believe that the progress we have made with our forces here in Europe has been in the opposite direction. Our conventional forces are better prepared than they were a year ago. And our combat readiness, particularly as far as the U. S. Forces are concerned, is in a better position today than it was when I was here in Brussels at the last meeting of the Defense Planning Committee. So I believe the premise on which you base that question is indeed, very faulty.

THREE ROADS TO PEACE—*Part II*

In the first of a two-part series carried in the June 6 Commanders Digest, Under Secretary of State (now Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare) Elliot L. Richardson outlined ways in which friction between the Soviet Union and United States might be lessened. In this second part of his address before a meeting of Soviet and American citizens in New York Mr. Richardson discusses the United Nations and the role it has played and must continue to play in the settlement of world disputes.

MR. RICHARDSON

'The U.N. . . . has done well in fostering economic development, scientific interchange, and in the area of human rights. It must now be strengthened and enabled to do the job its Charter envisions in the maintenance of peace.'

In Asia, too, regional organizations are beginning to develop. These, as President Nixon observed in his report to the Congress on foreign policy, "can be bulwarks of peace." We look forward to their undertaking such a role in the future, and even now we hope that the nations of the area can help resolve the conflict in Southeast Asia, for certainly they have a paramount interest in seeing this accomplished.

It will be especially important, however, to guard against expecting too much too quickly from the emergent regional consciousness in various parts of the world. The necessary concentration of regional power and the formation of institutions for regional action will take time. Early failures or false starts should not lead us to abandon the encouragement of truly regional initiatives.

Since regional action to maintain local stability or control local conflicts will not, in many cases, be adequate, a third form of action is also necessary: U.S.-Soviet cooperation in United Nations efforts to contain and, if possible, settle local conflicts. If this is to be accomplished, the United Nations role in the prevention, isolation, and resolution of local conflicts will have to be revitalized.

The U.N., now in its 25th Anniversary Year, has done well in fostering economic development, scientific interchange, and in the area of human rights. It must now be strengthened and enabled to do the job its Charter envisions in the maintenance of peace.

Cooperation Of All

It is time to break through the six-year-old impasse on peace-keeping procedures and peace-keeping machinery. An effective and reliable new set of ground rules must be developed, one which allows for a quick response in emergencies. United Nations action must take account of the interests of all, be impartial in intent and application, and call forth the cooperation of the contending parties as well as of those nations on whom the U.N. must depend for manpower and funds.

Among the key points on which the United States believes progress should be made are: The uses of "voluntary" peace-keeping, more precision and realism toward the balance of responsibilities between the Security Council and the Secretary General, firmer arrangements for ensuring the availability of personnel and facilities, widening the area of recruitment of peace-keepers, and more reliable and equitable sharing of costs.

'If the international community is to be insulated against the potential impact of local conflicts, efforts must be started at an early stage; quarrels and disputes cannot be ignored until the peace has been ruptured.'

I am glad to be able to take note . . . of the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union have already been discussing some of these matters both in informal meetings and in the negotiations of a United Nations working group in an attempt to work out guidelines for future international action. Although differences of approach exist between us with respect both to interpretation of the Charter and to practical mechanics, these need not stand in the way of uncovering sufficient

common ground to afford a practical basis for certain U.N. peace-keeping operations.

Settling World Disputes

When referring to "peace-keeping" I do not speak of it as applying only to actions taken after conflict is perilously close or has broken out. If the international community is to be insulated against the potential impact of local conflicts, efforts must be started at an early stage; quarrels and disputes cannot be ignored until the peace has been ruptured.

The U.N. Charter does not, after all, contemplate that the U.N. should be the last resort in efforts to preserve the peace. Articles 14, 33 and 36 of the Charter lay the basis for timely action by the General Assembly and the Security Council to recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment of international disputes. It is a sad commentary on recent trends that these articles have largely fallen into disuse, and some of the blame must surely be borne by the United States and the Soviet Union.

Article 99 also is relevant to this discussion. Under this provision, the Secretary General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security. In assigning the responsibility to the Secretary General, the Charter thus provides, in effect, for an early warning system. The responsibility for action resides elsewhere, but realistic and

'Revival of the moribund International Court of Justice would . . . help to strengthen the mechanisms designed to settle disputes peacefully.'

imaginative efforts are now called for to bring this potentially significant role of the Secretary General more fully into play.

If the full potential of the Secretary General's role has been neglected, the same can also be said of the Security Council.

The Government of Finland, which has been especially interested in such proposals, has suggested making the Security Council more of a center for world consultations by holding regular meetings at the foreign minister level.

Also worth exploring is a recent Brazilian proposal to set up small informal subcommittees of the Security Council to examine the fundamental issues in specific disputes and to provide good offices for peaceful settlement of disputes.

Peace-keeping by U.N. forces must be "impartial" and reliable, Under Secretary of State Richardson said. He also called for strengthening the United Nations and using its full potential for heading off possible outbreaks which would require a peace-keeping force. (United Nations Photo)

Revival of the moribund International Court of Justice would also help to strengthen the mechanisms designed to settle disputes peacefully. Secretary (of State William) Rogers (recently) proposed several ways to enhance the role of the Court, which does not now have a single pending case before it.*

The Secretary suggested that greater use be made of the chambers of the Court; that the chambers meet outside The Hague; that regional chambers be established, particularly in the developing world; and that regional organizations be given access to the Court. Noting that the major problem is the failure of states to submit disputes to the Court, Secretary Rogers underlined the intention of the United States to make more use of the Court in its own international disputes. He encouraged other states to do the same, adding: *"Mankind eventually must become wise enough to settle disputes in peace and justice under law."*

The approaches I have outlined—the creation of spheres of restraint, the encouragement of regional institutions, and the strengthening of international peace-keeping machinery—will not by themselves, it is true, bring us to this goal. Neither will they guarantee our safe passage to a securely ordered world free of the shadow of thermonuclear war. They are, however, steps on the way—steps we can take now.

If we succeed in these, we shall have the chance to take other, longer steps. If we do not succeed in these, we may never have that chance.

*(See Commanders Digest, Vol. 8, No. 9, May 30, 1970)

COMMANDERS DIGEST

THIS PUBLICATION CONTAINS OFFICIAL INFORMATION, NEWS AND POLICY, DIRECT FROM WASHINGTON AUTHORIZED SOURCES.

Published weekly by American Forces Press Service, 1117 N. 19th St., Arlington, Va. 22209, a unified activity of the Office of Information for the Armed Forces, OASD (M&RA). Reproduction of content is authorized. Suggested dateline for materials used is WASHINGTON (AFPS).

CAMBODIA AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

(Citing international law and the United Nations Charter, John R. Stevenson, Legal Adviser of the Department of State, recently presented the U.S. Government's views on the South Vietnamese and United States operations in Cambodia. Excerpts of his address before the Association of the Bar of the City of New York are given here.)

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the questions of international law arising out of our actions in Cambodia. It is important for the Government of the United States to explain the legal basis for its actions, not merely to pay proper respect to the law, but also because the precedent created by the use of armed forces in Cambodia by the United States can be affected significantly by our legal rationale. . . . I believe the United States has a strong interest in developing rules of international law that limit claimed rights to use armed force and encourage the peaceful resolution of disputes.

No Compromise Of Neutrality

One way to have limited the effects of the Cambodian action would have been to obtain the advance, express request of the Government of Cambodia for our military actions on Cambodian territory. This might well have been possible. However, had we done so, we would have compromised the neutrality of the Cambodian Government and moved much closer to a situation in which the United States was committing its armed forces to help Cambodia defend itself against the North Vietnamese attack.

As the President has made clear, the purpose of our armed forces in Cambodia is not to help defend the Government of Cambodia, but rather to help defend South Vietnam and United States troops in South Vietnam from the continuing North Vietnamese armed attack.

The North Vietnamese have continued to press their attack against South Vietnam since 1964 and have made increasing use of Cambodian territory in the furtherance of that attack.

In the past five years, 150,000 enemy troops have been infiltrated into South Vietnam through Cambodia. In 1969 alone, 60,000 of their military forces moved in from Cambodia.

Bases For Attacks

During 1968 and 1969 the Cambodian bases adjacent to the South Vietnamese provinces of Tay Ninh, Pleiku, and Kontum have served as staging areas for regimental-size Communist forces for at least three series of major engagements—the 1968 Tet offensive, the May 1968 offensive and the post-Tet 1969 offensive.

Both the previous Cambodian Government under Prince Sihanouk and the present government headed by Lon Nol have made efforts to limit, if not prevent, these violations of Cambodia's rights as a neutral.

After the change of government on March 18 [1970], in which the United States was not involved in any respect, Cambodian police and other officials were driven out of many localities in the border area. When it became apparent to North Vietnam that the new Cambodian Government was not willing to permit the same wide scope of unneutral use of its territory by North Vietnamese forces as the previous government, the decision was evidently taken to expel all Cambodian Government presence from the border areas and move militarily against the Cambodian army, with a view to linking up all the sanctuaries and the Port of Sihanoukville. This would have produced a unified and protected sanctuary from the Gulf of Siam along the entire border of South Vietnam to Laos, with virtually unrestricted movement and unlimited supply access.

That is the rapidly developing situation the President faced at the time of his April 30 decision to make limited military incursions into the sanctuaries in Cambodia, which had been militarily occupied by North Vietnam. It was impossible for the Cambodian Government to take action itself to prevent these violations of its neutral rights. Its efforts to do so had led to the expulsion of its forces. In these circumstances, the question arises of what are the rights of those who suffer from these violations of Cambodian neutrality.

Right Of Self-Help

It is the view of some scholars that when the traditional diplomatic remedy of a claim for compensation would not adequately compensate a belligerent injured by a neutral's failure to prevent illegal use of its territory by another belligerent, the injured belligerent has the right of self-help to prevent the hostile use of the neutral's territory to its prejudice.

The more conservative view is that a belligerent may take reasonable action against another belligerent violating the neutral's territory only when required to do so in self-defense.

The United States itself has sometimes in the past found it necessary to take action on neutral territory in order to protect itself against hostile operations. Professor Hyde cites many such instances of which I would note General Jackson's incursion into Spanish West Florida in 1818 in order to check attacks by Seminole Indians on United States positions in Georgia; the action taken against adventurers occupying Amelia Island in 1817, when Spain was unable to exercise control over it; and the expedition against Francisco Villa in 1916, after his attacks on American territory which Mexico had been unable to prevent.

I have summarized these precedents and the views of scholars and governments principally to show general recognition of the need to provide a lawful and effective remedy to a belligerent harmed by its enemy's violations of a neutral's rights. . . . We all recognize that, whatever the merits of these views prior to 1945, the adoption of the United Nations Charter changed the situation by imposing new and important limitations on the use of armed force.

The U.N. Charter

In general, under the Charter the use of armed force is prohibited except as authorized by the United Nations or by a regional organization within the scope of its competence under Chapter 8 of the Charter, or, where the Security Council has not acted, in individual or collective self-defense against an armed attack. It is this latter basis on which we rely for our

(Continued On Next Page)

Secretary Volpe Explains Coast Guard Mission, DOT Programs

(Continued From Page One)

they inspect vessels that are coming in, and this is all part of transportation.

Before a vessel can sail into our waters it has to be examined and inspected so that it meets the requirements of the United States Coast Guard.

It performs a variety of missions, most of which are transportation oriented. They do a lot of research work and are involved very definitely for instance in the environment in all areas.

They are doing research now on how to prevent these oil slicks. And when they do occur how to remove the oil as rapidly as possible.

Q—Are there any joint training programs available at the present time for a person in the military for example?

A—Well, we have talked to Secretary (Melvin) Laird about utilizing these men as they come out, and we haven't formalized anything yet but we have made available to the Department of Defense what our needs are.

We put these men through an academy at Oklahoma City, our Federal Aviation Academy. And that academy takes these men and if they have already had some training such as military controllers, and I am not restricting these just to men who have been controllers, this is available to any man who has at least a high school education and who wants to get into a job where the reward is pretty good.

The pay is up now to $22,000 plus and it is a work which is rather difficult during certain periods of the day, but there are other periods of the day when the work load is not quite as heavy. But we have worked with the Department of Defense and we hope to work out a program where perhaps for the last few weeks or months they are in the service they might be getting some of the types of training helpful to them when they come into the civilian life.

Q—We pay taxes on gasoline; the government spends as you mentioned about 90 per cent of their own money that is given for highway construction. Why, then, especially on the east coast, when you travel some place you have to pay fees or tolls?

A—These are toll roads, most of which were built before the interstate highway system was started in 1956.

It is our hope that some day those can be made entirely free —but that won't be tomorrow.

Cambodia And International Law

(Continued From Preceding Page)

actions against North Vietnamese armed forces and bases in Cambodia.

Since 1965 we and the Republic of Vietnam have been engaged in collective measures of self-defense against an armed attack from North Vietnam. Increasingly since that time the territory of Cambodia has been used by North Vietnam as a base of military operations to carry out that attack, and it long ago reached a level that would have justified us in taking appropriate measures of self-defense on the territory of Cambodia.

Prior to undertaking military action the United States explored to the fullest other means of peaceful settlement. We awaited the outcome of the Cambodian Government's efforts to negotiate with the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong agreed limitations on the use by the latter of Cambodian territory—without success. We have continually tried in the Paris Talks to bring about serious negotiation of the issues involved in the war.

Limits On Our Actions

The United States has imposed severe limits on the activities of U.S. forces. They will remain in Cambodia only a limited time—not beyond July 1—in a limited area—not beyond 21 miles from the border—and with a limited purpose—to capture or destroy North Vietnamese supplies, to destroy base installations, and to disrupt communications. To that maximum extent possible, we have directed our forces at enemy base areas and have tried to avoid civilian population centers. We have limited our area of operations to that part of Cambodia from which Cambodian authority had been eliminated and which was occupied by the North Vietnamese.

The Cambodian Government and the Cambodian people are not the targets of our operations.

Our actions in Cambodia are appropriate measures of legitimate collective self-defense, and we have so reported to the United Nations, as required by Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

NEW COMMANDANT—Admiral Chester R. Bender is sworn in as the new Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard by Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe during ceremonies June 1 aboard the Coast Guard Cutter Gallatin at the Navy Yard, Washington, D.C. Admiral Bender succeeded Admiral Willard J. Smith, who retired after holding the top post since June 1966. (U.S. Coast Guard Photo)

New Banking Concept Okayed For Military Stationed Overseas

(Continued From Page Two)

iceman such as credit unions and the Uniformed Services Savings Deposit program."

About 75 persons attended the Hawaii conference and studied the entire spectrum of banking as it pertains to military personnel and their dependents in all Pacific Commands. They represented 30 separate organizations within government and commercial banking institutions. The conference proved very useful to the Defense Department and Treasury Department for monitoring and evaluating the policies and procedures applicable to military banking facilities.

The conferees were unanimous in their approval of recent policy changes in DOD Instruction 1000.12 (dated Jan. 30, 1970) that clarifies the status of military banking institutions. For example, in the past most banking facilities have been considered in the same category as Defense contractors. This created many difficulties and problems for the banking institutions when they could not obtain adequate logistical support such as buildings, utilities, transportation, etc., from local economies or from the local military commands.

Now, officials say, military banking facilities are recognized as financial agents of the U.S. Government and are to be accorded logistical support and services consistent with support accorded nonappropriated fund activities serving the Defense Department.

LOAN PROGRAM

On the subject of loans, the conferees at Hawaii recognized the need for greater uniformity in the practices followed by the various banking institutions for making personal loans and for combating the usury practices of "loan sharks" who operate in the immediate vicinity of many overseas military installations.

As a possible solution, uniform loan policies were proposed that would be applicable to all military banking facilities. The conferees approved them for adoption and they will be incorporated in a future change to DOD Instruction 1000.-12, officials said.

Banking institutions that operate military banking facilities for military personnel and that will offer the new special banking arrangements are American Express International Banking Corporation; Bank of America; The Chase Manhattan Bank, and First National City Bank of New York.

These banking institutions provide the personnel and expertise necessary to operate the military banking facilities, subject to the guidance and instructions issued by both the Treasury and Defense Departments.

Special Committee Completes Study Of Army Confinement System

A special civilian committee has made 61 recommendations for improvement of facilities and practices of the U.S. Army confinement system.

The committee of six prominent penologists was appointed by Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor in April 1969. It is headed by Mr. Austin H. MacCormick, Executive Director of the Osborne Association, Inc., New York City, a non-profit association for correctional improvement.

The study was concentrated on the Army's stockade system, correctional training facility, disciplinary barracks, regulations and controls, organization and management, and research and statistics.

As part of the study, the committee visited 23 stockades worldwide, the Correctional Training Facility, Ft. Riley, Kan., and the U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, Ft. Leavenworth, Kan.

During the past year the Army has been concurrently studying the confinement system problem and has a number of actions underway consistent with committee recommendations to improve the stockade system. These actions include:

—The training of more than 2,000 specialists in a new course for preassignment training of correctional specialists at the U.S. Army Military Police School, Ft. Gordon, Ga. Increased numbers of officers and noncommissioned officers were selected for attending the course in corrections at American University, Washington, D.C., and for attendance at other civilian universities to obtain graduate degrees in corrections.

—Authorization of an additional 1,456 personnel for assignment to stockade staffs.

—In response to modern correctional concepts and designs the Secretary of Defense has authorized more than $8 million for new stockade construction at four military installations.

A FIRST—Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, center, was among the distinguished guests who attended a June 11 Pentagon ceremony in which Army Colonels Anna M. V. Hays, left, and Elizabeth P. Hoisington were promoted to brigadier general and became the first women to hold general officer rank in the U.S. Armed Forces. Brig. Gen. Hays is Director of the Army Nurse Corps. Brig. Gen. Hoisington is Director of the Women's Army Corps. (DOD Photo)

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.
Price 5 cents (single copy). Subscription Price: $2.50 per year; $3.25 additional for foreign mailing.
☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1969 393/222/S-51